

Re: Appendix F - Final Draft?

Thomas Bateson to: Bob Benson

12/20/2012 09:46 AM

From: Thomas Bateson/DC/USEPA/US

To:

Cc: brattin@srcinc.com, David Berry/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Krista Christensen/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Leonid Kopylev/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Bob,

Thanks for the call the other day. I was home with my sick son that day. I spoke with Leonid and Krista and we are largely comfortable with moving forward. The revised Appendix F is much improved, however, we want to note that many statements are made without references or data/plots to back them up. In some instances, perhaps the Borton work could be used as a reference.

One particulate concern is the section that Leonid flagged regarding the seeming discrepancy between the work time you used and the work time documented in the OSHA report. We would like some kind of a reference included to back up your decision. I don't know what material you have to that effect but perhaps you can reference a personal communication with Lockey if that was the basis. I think that once this point is settled, the work should go forward and the other points can be attended to later.

I appreciate all the extra work that you and others have put into this and I think the improvements were well worth the additional effort. Nearly there.

Tom

* Note that I included Leonid's comments below which he already circulated and I have included additional comments from Krista here:

- 1) On F-15, the language about the 'window' or 'radius' now reads "The same radius was applied to each window for a given data set." I understand that to mean the smoothing parameter was defined separately for each job but it is a bit unclear.
- 2) On F-16, we had asked why they used the power function for the variance; now reads "Model convergence was consistently achieved with a power function model." It might be helpful to edit the preceding sentence to clarify that the options they tried were 'standard' statistical approaches (which I assume they are).
- 3) Also on F-16 - maybe because I haven't drunk my coffee yet, but why did they have to manually vary the value of theta (not estimate it as a parameter)? At any rate, I thought it would be helpful to specify which other values were tested initially and in post-hoc analyses ("Post hoc sensitivity analyses were performed in which other values of θ were individually analyzed and convergence of the model with the chosen θ was confirmed.")
- 4) F.6.4 - this is just placeholder text, right?

Leonid Kopylev---12/17/2012 02:02:06 PM---Bob, thank you for the new draft of Appendix F, it reads better. See attached file for comments, but

From: Leonid Kopylev/DC/USEPA/US

To: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: brattin@srcinc.com, David Berry/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Krista Christensen/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Thomas Bateson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 12/17/2012 02:02 PM
Subject: Re: Appendix F - Final Draft?

Bob,

thank you for the new draft of Appendix F, it reads better. See attached file for comments, but here are three areas which, in my opinion, need improvement. Fortunately, all 3 areas should be easy to improve, albeit one of these goes beyond "word changes".

1. The document lacks transparency. It often tells what was done and what people doing found, but doesn't provide data. I flagged several of those Just one of the examples where data summaries would go a long way "Personal and area samples were plotted by year and department and found to be visually similar. In addition the range, means, and standard deviations were approximately equal"
2. Several of us at NCEA asked several times for conventional measures of goodness-of-fit, e.g. chi square. The document seem to use Figures as measures of reasonableness of fit, but this is qualitative, and, for example, BMDS technical guidance suggests quantitative approaches.
3. The schedule of work that you often told us was of your decisions flatly contradicts schedule described in contemporary OSHA document. Your schedule assigns them more working hours and hence higher exposure.

Please provide evidence for your decisions or follow published results.

These are my comments. Others in NCEA will likely provide comments separately.

Thanks,
Leonid



Appendix F REVISED v4.lk.docx

Bob Benson---12/14/2012 02:42:14 PM---Here is what I hope is the final draft of Appendix F with Tables and Figures. Please review and let

From: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US
To: Thomas Bateson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Krista Christensen/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Leonid Kopylev/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: brattin@srcinc.com, David Berry/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 12/14/2012 02:42 PM
Subject: Appendix F - Final Draft?

Here is what I hope is the final draft of Appendix F with Tables and Figures. Please review and let us know if you have any word changes.

EPA

We should have the cumulative exposure calculations next week.

[attachment "Appendix F REVISED v4.docx" deleted by Leonid Kopylev/DC/USEPA/US]

[attachment "Appendix F Figures.piz" deleted by Leonid Kopylev/DC/USEPA/US]

[attachment "Appendix F Tables.piz" deleted by Leonid Kopylev/DC/USEPA/US]